# This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning Operations and is not part of the Official Record

## **BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

BLACK BORDERS

IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES

FADED TEXT OR DRAWING

BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING

SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES

COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS

GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY

OTHER:

## IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.





## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/902,263	07/10/2001	Srinivas Venkatram	117.008	8751
24943	7590 08/24/2004	•	EXAMINER	
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP LLP			HOLMES, MICHAEL B	
12 SOUTH F SUITE 1205	IRST STREET		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SAN IOSE	CA 95113		2121	

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/902,263	VENKATRAM, SRINIVAS				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Michael B. Holmes	2121				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from to cause the application to become ABANDONEI	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 July 2001.						
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ This	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
, <u> </u>	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4)  Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6)  Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected. 7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 July 2001 is/are: a)  Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.	☑ accepted or b)☐ objected to be drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See tion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
<ul> <li>2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)</li> <li>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>07102001</u>.</li> </ul>		eater Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 09/902,263

Art Unit: 2121



#### UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 - www.uspto.gov

#### Examiner's Detailed Office Action

- 1. This Office Action is responsive to application 09/902,263, filed July 10, 2001.
- 2. Claims 1-11 have been examined.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

The invention as disclosed in **claims 1-11** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being non-statutory subject matter. Applicant's invention appears to directed towards the technological arts. However, applicant's claim language is not limited to a practical application. In particular, examiner has found the claimed subject matter, to be one of three exclusions recognized, outside the statutory category of invention, i.e., *an abstract idea*. The manipulation of an *abstract idea* is not concrete or tangible.

Moreover, applicant's claimed invention relates to non-functional "Descriptive Material" intended to constitute a data structure. However, it *lacks* the "functional descriptive material"

Application/Control Number: 09/902,263

Art Unit: 2121

which is normally construed to be a data structures and computer programs which impart functionality when employed as a computer component.

Furthermore, the claims are not claimed to be practiced on a computer-readable medium. This is to say, it is conceivable that applicant's invention, can be worked out on a medium that is *not* a computer-readable medium. Examiner contends, on that basis alone, the claims are clearly nonstatutory. As a result, examiner will *not* speculate as to the intended meaning. Whereas applicant discloses no "certain substances" that have been "transformed or reduced" and applicant's claim language disclose no *specific* computer-readable medium.

4. Therefore, claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 USC § 101.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
  - The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
- 6. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Specifically, if the application fails as a matter of fact to satisfy 35 U.S.C. § 101, then the application also fails as a matter of law to enable one of ordinary skill in the art to use the invention under 35 U.S.C. § 112."); In re Kirk, 376 F.2d 936, 942, 153 USPQ 48, 53 (CCPA 1967) MPEP 2107.01 (IV)

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
  - The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 8. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. What are the specific knowledge requirements of an organization?

#### Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and (listed of form **PTO-892**) not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure as follows. Applicant or applicant's representative is respectfully reminded that in process of patent prosecution i.e., amending of claims in response to a rejection of claims set forth by the Examiner per Title 35 U.S.C. The patentable novelty must be clearly shown in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited and any objections made. Moreover, applicant or applicant's representative must clearly show how the amendments avoid or overcome such references and objections. *See* 37 CFR § 1.111(c).

## Correspondence Information

10. Any inquiries concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Michael B. Holmes** who may be reached via telephone at

Application/Control Number: 09/902,263

Art Unit: 2121

(703) 308-6280. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. eastern standard time.

If you need to send the Examiner, a facsimile transmission regarding After Final issues, please send it to (703) 746-7238. If you need to send an Official facsimile transmission, please send it to (703) 746-7239. If you would like to send a Non-Official (draft) facsimile transmission the fax is (703) 746-7240. If any attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's Supervisor, Anthony Knight, may be reached at (703) 308-3179.

Any response to this office action should be mailed too:

Director of Patents and Trademarks Washington, D.C. 20231. Hand-delivered responses should be delivered to the Receptionist, located on the fourth floor of

Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive Arlington, Virginia.

Michael B. Holmes

Patent Examiner
Artificial Intelligence
Art Unit 2121

United States Department of Commerce Patent & Trademark Office Anthony Knight

Supervisory Patent Examiner

Group 3600